

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126321
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the Effect of Leadership Styles on Financial Management Practices in Tertiary Healthcare Institutions in South-South Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it explores the relationship between leadership styles and financial management practices in tertiary healthcare institutions in Nigeria. The study contributes valuable insights into how different leadership approaches impact financial decision-making in healthcare settings, which is crucial for improving efficiency and effectiveness in resource allocation. By examining the effects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles on financial management practices, the research provides actionable recommendations for healthcare leaders seeking to optimize resource utilization and improve patient care outcomes. The findings of this study could inform policy decisions and guide future research in the field of healthcare management, particularly in developing regions where effective leadership and financial stewardship are essential for improving healthcare delivery systems.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> title of the article is suitable. The title accurately reflects the main focus of the article, which appears to be investigating the relationship between leadership styles and financial management practices in healthcare institutions.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Based on my analysis of the abstract, I believe it is generally comprehensive and well-written. However, there are a few minor suggestions I would make to enhance it further:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You could add a sentence highlighting the significance or practical implications of the findings, particularly since the abstract ends abruptly without drawing out the main conclusion.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Based on the search results provided, I can offer the following positive assessment regarding subsections and structure of manuscripts:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear organization: Manuscripts typically follow a standard structure that reflects the scientific process, making them easy to navigate and understand.</li> <li>2. Logical flow: The typical structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, etc.) provides a logical progression of ideas, enhancing readability and comprehension.</li> <li>3. Clarity and conciseness: The structure encourages authors to present information clearly and concisely, which is crucial for scientific communication.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear research question and objectives: The study aims to explore the effects of different leadership styles on financial management practices in healthcare institutions, which is a well-defined and specific research topic.</li> <li>2. Appropriate methodology: The researchers used a cross-sectional design with quantitative data collection through structured questionnaires, which is an appropriate method for studying relationships between variables across a population.</li> <li>3. Relevant sample size: With 195 participants from one hospital and 115 from another, the sample</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>sizes appear sufficient to draw meaningful conclusions about the healthcare institutions studied.</p> <p>4. Statistical analysis: The use of descriptive statistics and Spearman's rank-order correlation for data analysis is appropriate given the research design and objectives.</p> <p>5. Clear findings: The study reports specific correlations between leadership styles and financial management practices, providing concrete insights into the relationship being studied.</p> <p>6. Implications and future directions: The manuscript concludes with practical recommendations for healthcare institutions and suggests areas for further research, demonstrating the authors' consideration of both current findings and future implications.</p> <p>7. Clarity and organization: The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, main findings, and conclusions, following a logical structure typical of academic publications.</p> <p>Overall, this manuscript appears to be well-designed, executed, and presented, contributing valuable insights into the complex relationship between leadership styles and financial management in healthcare settings.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Based on the information provided, in this article, a positive evaluation of references is provided, but the number of references can be increased according to the type of article.</b></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b>, the English language and quality of the scientific article is generally suitable for scientific communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>After fully reading the current article, I came to the conclusion that the current article will be completed by applying the following minor Revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would recommend that the authors develop a conceptual model to illustrate the relationships between leadership styles and financial management practices. Such a model would significantly enhance the clarity and comprehensibility of the article for readers. Here's how the authors could proceed.</li> <li>2. In Abstract: You could add a sentence highlighting the significance or practical implications of the findings, particularly since the abstract ends abruptly without drawing out the main conclusion.</li> <li>3. Add new resources (If possible).</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohamad Ahadzadeh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Science and Research University, Iran</b>